

is he going to resolve this problem? Would the hon. Minister kindly reply?

डा० सत्य नारायण जटिया: माननीय सदस्य ने जो चिंता व्यक्त की है उसमें यह कहा गया है कि क्या सरकार के पास इस प्रकार की जानकारी है इन सारी बातों को निर्मूल करने के लिए कि कांट्रैक्ट लेबर नहीं लगाई जानी चाहिए। जहां तक माननीय सदस्य जानते हैं ठेका लेबर लगाने के लिए केवल उन्हीं कामों पर प्रतिषेध लगाया गया है जो मुख्य काम हैं, उत्पादन से संबंधित हैं। जहां तक इस बात में कोई शिकायत प्राप्त होने की बात है उस संबंध में मेरा कहना है अभी तक इस बारे में कोई शिकायत प्राप्त नहीं हुई है जिससे कि इस संबंध में कोई फैसला करने का काम आगे बढ़ाया जा सके। कोई शिकायत प्राप्त होने पर ही हम जरूरी कार्रवाई करेंगे।

Review of foreign policy in relation to Pakistan

*263. **SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD:** Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are considering any proposal to review the foreign policy pertaining to Pakistan's involvement in cross-border terrorism; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Government remains steadfast in its resolve to defeat Pakistan's state sponsorship of terrorism in Jammu and Kashmir and/or elsewhere in India.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Sir, the established policy of the Government of India, all along, with regard to the issue of Kashmir and solving the problem of Kashmir has been that it shall be discussed and solved bilaterally with no third-party intervention whatsoever. The Government of India has taken a position that India shall not talk to Pakistan till Pakistan stops cross-border terrorism. Sir, Pakistan is continuously aiding, abetting, training and sponsoring terrorism for the last one decade. As a result of which, thousands of people have been killed and lakhs and lakhs of people have suffered in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Part (a) of my supplementary is: Should Pakistan decide not to stop cross-border terrorism for

another one decade, does it mean that the Government of India shall not talk to Pakistan till such time? Part (b) of my supplementary is: Is it not a fact that when the hon. Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, took his Lahore visit in February, 1999, he had full knowledge that Pakistan is fully engaged in providing all sorts of support to cross-border terrorism, terrorism was at its peak in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and hundreds of people were killed day in and day out and so much so, 25 people were killed while the hon. Prime Minister was still in Pakistan? Is it not a fact that at that point of time i.e., in February, 1999, the Government of India did not consider aiding and abetting terrorism as a disqualification of Pakistan to enter into a dialogue with India? Is this not a major shift in foreign policy with regard to Pakistan in February, 1999 and 2000?

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: No, Sir. It is not a shift in the foreign policy because so far as the conditions for talks are concerned, we have been consistently saying that we are ready to have a dialogue provided it is within the Shimla Agreement and the Lahore peace process. India is always willing to have a friendly relationship with its neighbouring countries. In fact, all the neighbouring countries in the Eastern area of India are in extreme friendship; in fact, all over the world, except something happening in the Western border.

Secondly, the hon. Prime Minister's visit is another evidence to show our willingness as to how to go ahead with peace process and that is the reason why the Lahore peace process came into being. At that time, even though terrorism was there, there was an elected Government there and now there is no such Government existing in Pakistan.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Sir, the first part of the reply given by the hon. Minister is giving totally a new dimension to the issue. So far, the stand of the Government of India has been that we are not ready to talk to Pakistan till Pakistan stops cross-border terrorism. Now, the hon. Minister has said that now there is no elected Government but there is a military rule. Sir, is it not a fact that in the past 52 years, Pakistan has been mostly ruled by dictators, be it Ayub Khan or Zia-ul-Haq, and the Government has been talking to them. So, what is the truth, whether it is because of

dictatorship that you are not talking to them or is it because that they are not stopping cross-border terrorism?

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: For any peace talks, there must be conditions to talk. While having the Lahore Peace Process, the Kargil attack took place from behind the back. Therefore, the conditions have to be there so that we can talk. We have to shake hands but we cannot shake hands with persons whose hands are bloodstained. Therefore, we have to be very firm. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Sir, this is not a reply to my question.

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: The entire evidence of Pakistan's involvement in cross-border terrorism, including the withdrawal of ceasefire by the Hizbul Mujahideen, is there. Therefore, Sir, the hon. Member will appreciate that unless conditions are there for the purpose of having a dialogue, we cannot talk.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Sir, I need your protection. I have put a very, very pointed question, whether the Government is not ready to talk to Pakistan because Pakistan is aiding and abetting terrorism; or, because the Government is not ready to talk to military rulers. Which position is the Government taking? Or, is it both? If it is both, did it not apply last February?

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: Sir, the cross-border terrorism is in our minds, and this, along with other conditions, as enshrined in Simla Agreement and Lahore Peace Process, are necessary for holding talks.

श्री गुलाम नबी आज़ाद: मेरा अभी सेकेंड पार्ट नहीं बताया है... (व्यवधान) Sir, I have not asked about the second part. I sought clarification only on the first part of the Question.

श्री सभापति: आलराइट, इनको कर लेने दीजिए।

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Sir, Today the Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir has indicated—it has appeared in the Press—that talks with the Hizbul Mujahideen are still going on; while the Hizbul Mujahideen's Commander, Mr. Masood, has said that after the withdrawal of the ceasefire, they have no contacts whatsoever with the Government. The unilateral ceasefire was

announced by Hizbul Mujahideen's Deputy Chief, Abdul Majeedar, which was subsequently supported by his Chief, Mr. Salahudin, from Pakistan. Now, as far as the withdrawal of ceasefire is concerned, it has not been announced by the person who had announced the ceasefire. It has been announced by Mr. Salahudin from Pakistan. It has not been supported by Abdul Majeedar; however, it has been supported from Kashmir by one of their Commanders, Mr. Masood. Should we take that Salahudin and his group are for the withdrawal of the ceasefire and the Deputy Chief Commander, Majeedar, who had announced the ceasefire, is still for talks?

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: Sir, the hon. Member is correct. Mr Majeedar made the ceasefire announcement unilaterally. India immediately accepted that willingly. Almost all the formalities had been completed. Both sides had selected their people for talks. Secondly, when Majeedar unilaterally called for ceasefire and India accepted it, it was from Kashmir; while, when Salahudin did it, that is, announced the withdrawal, it was from Islamabad. This also indicates the hand of Pakistan in sabotaging the entire peace process.

सरदार गुरुचरण सिंह तोहङ्गा: सभापति महोदय, मैं आपके जरिए विदेश मंत्रालय से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि विदेश मंत्रालय को क्या इस बात का ज्ञान है कि जब से काबुल में तालिबान की सरकार स्थापित हुई है, उस वक्त से गैरमुस्लिम जो भी थे—हिन्दू, सिख—वे भगा दिए गए। आखिर मैं एकदम उन्होंने अल्टीमेटम दिया। एक डेट दी कि इस डेट के पहले पहले सब चले जाएं। तो दो सौ परिवार जिनके पास पासपोर्ट नहीं हैं वे नानकाना साहब में पनाह लिए बैठे हैं। क्या सरकार इन दो सौ परिवारों को जो हिन्दू और सिख परिवार हैं, वापस भारत लाने के लिए आरबी० पासपोर्ट जारी करेगी?

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: Sir, it is our highest concern to give such a protection. The matter, related with the particular place, is not with me. I will find out from the Home Minister and inform the hon. Member.

सरदार गुरुचरण सिंह तोहङ्गा: मैं होम मिनिस्ट्री के ध्यान में इस बात को ला देता हूं, लेकिन होम मिनिस्ट्री और विदेश मंत्रालय, यह दोनों का काम है कि उनको वापस भारत लाए क्योंकि इतनी देर से वे बैठे हुए हैं।

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: Sir, the suggestion of the hon. Member has been noted.

प्रो॰ रामगोपाल यादवः श्रीमन्, अब जब गवर्नमेंट का यह फैसला है ही कि पाकिस्तान द्वारा संचालित टैरोरिज्म जब तक चलता रहेगा तब तक उससे बात नहीं होगी, तो अब दो ही रस्ते बचते हैं, या तो उधर से टैरोरिस्ट हमारे यहां आएं और आकर हमारे लोगों पर हमला करें, फिर फोर्स के लोग उनका पीछा करें, उसमें कुछ लोग मारे जाएं और कुछ अंधेरे का लाभ उठा कर भाग जाएं, या तो यह सिलसिला चलता रहे या फिर दूसरा सिलसिला यह हो सकता है कि जहां से ये संचालित हो रहे हैं उन अद्दों पर हमारी सेना या फोर्स अटैक करे। अब जब पाकिस्तान से बात नहीं हो रही है, तो इन दोनों में से कौन सा रस्ता सरकार चुनना चाहती है, यह मैं जानना चाहता हूं?

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: Sir, we are respecting the Line of Control. Our Army and the security forces, all along the line of control, are fully alert. Therefore, there is no cause for concern in this respect.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, while replying to the supplementary put by Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad, the hon. Minister injected a new element, a new dimension, in our relations with Pakistan, that is, about the character of the Government. "To resolve the problem, we have also to see as to whether the Government is an elected Government or not". This was never the consideration before. We always thought that it was the job and responsibility of the people of that country to choose the Government. In this connection, I would like to know from the hon. Minister, to what extent the Government is going to gain by taking this high rhetoric posture. Even yesterday, the hon. Home Minister, while making a statement on the failure of talks—peace talks with the Hizbul Mujahideen—used such terms which were superlative in language. Whether the Government believes, as Shri Ram Gopal Yadav pointed out, that "yes; terrorism will continue—we have not been able to tackle it for the last ten years—it will continue, or, we will accept third party intervention by taking a position that we will not start talking with Pakistan unless they stop aiding and abetting terrorism. I do not know whether any country, whatsoever be the name, would come and say "yes; we have stopped aiding and abetting terrorism; now you should begin a dialogue with us." I have never heard of any such country and I cannot contemplate that such a situation will

arise. Therefore, I would like to know from the Government, what will be the ultimate result of this position.

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: Sir, the position is simple. There is no high rhetoric, either in the Lok Sabha or in this House. The position is this. There are several conditions which must be brought in at the negotiating table. Sir, while the talks are going on, if a deal takes place, what will be the position? It is a dialogue for peace. There are several conditions—I mentioned some of those conditions while replying to the question of Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad. So far as the point is concerned as to how long the terrorism will continue; and whether a country will come and say that we have stopped aiding and abetting terrorism, Mr. Mukherjee, who has a long experience, knows that a country does not come and say that they have stopped aiding and abetting terrorism. Neither they take the responsibility that they are doing it. We want to see that our borders are free from terrorist activities. Pakistan is doing all these mischief. We have got evidence for it. Our planes have been hijacked. Therefore, some conditions have to be there as to when these two countries can sit and talk.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: This is not about the character of the Government, whether elected or military dictatorship, it is all about the peaceful conditions, I agree. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is the stated position of the Government that unless an elected Government comes to power in Pakistan, we will not resume the talks; or unless a peaceful and conducive atmosphere is created, we cannot begin the talks. This position should be clarified.

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: Sir, the position is absolutely clear. When the peace process started, there was an elected Government. The Pakistan Government is responsible to the people. We, being the largest democracy, are upholders of democratic principles. One of the conditions is,...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: We are exporting democracy to other countries.

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: ... if democracy comes over there, then the talks would be relevant.

Sir, whatever be the conditions, we are trying to see that a democratic Government is set up there so that the talks could be relevant.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, I think the hon. Prime Minister should say something on this.

प्रधान मंत्री (श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी): सभापति जी, हमारी इच्छा है कि दुनिया के सारे देशों में लोकतंत्र हो। पड़ोस में तो हम लोकतंत्रीय देश चाहते हैं, लेकिन अगर लोकतंत्र का तख्ता पलटकर सेना सत्ता संभाल लेती है तो वह एक विरोध का कारण बनता है। हम अपनी नाखुशी प्रकट करते हैं। लेकिन उस को हम शर्त नहीं बनाते बातचीत करने के लिए। जो जैसा है हम उसी के साथ निपटने को तैयार हैं।

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: सर, प्रधान मंत्री जी के बयान से मेरा सवाल सहज हो गया। Sir, I would like to draw the kind attention of the Government and the hon. Prime Minister, through you, to the following thing. While replying to a started question No. 161, only last week, i.e. 3rd August, 2000, the Cabinet Minister of External Affairs said—उन का मैं पूरा जवाब नहीं पढ़ रहा हूं, उस के पहले तीन सेटिंस पढ़ रहा हूं और वह कूं एस के मीडिएशन के बारे में है। सवाल यह था कि “whether United States wants India and Pakistan to resume talks and...” उनके रिप्लाई का पहला प्रेरणा यह था जैसा कि अभी आप ने भी कहा “It is the Government's position that Pakistan must create appropriate conditions for the dialogue to start, by stopping its sponsorship of and support to cross-border terrorism in India.” प्रणब जी ने भी जैसे कहा और प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी कहा, लेकिन आप के सम्में, आप के मिनिस्टर ऑफस्टेट फार एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स ने सभा चलने से पहले चेन्नई में प्रेस कंफरेंस में कहा है। इसलिए प्रणब जी ने भी कहा और मैं भी कह रहा हूं कि यह प्रत्यक्ष रिटैरिक्स है, भाषणबाजी हो रही है और दो डिफरेंट परसेप्शन्स आ रहे हैं। सर, इंडो पाक रिलेशंस इस सब-कांटीनेट के लिए बहुत ही अहमियत रखते हैं। इस के लिए छाँयलांग भी चाहिए और उन को क्रॉस-बोर्डर कार्यवाही के लिए मना भी करना पड़ेगा। लेकिन आप उस में अपने-अपने रंग लगाते हैं, अगर इंडियन गवर्नमेंट का डिफरेंट परसेप्शन है और उस में आप की कैरियर के एक ही मंत्रालय के दो मंत्री दो दिशा दिखाते हैं तो हम किस दिशा की ओर जा रहे हैं?.....(व्यवधान).....

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: It is not a question. Allegations cannot be made by the hon. Member against the Minister. Let there be a question. ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: जो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बताई है, वही दिशा है।(व्यवधान)...

श्री मोहम्मद सल्तीम: तो क्या प्रधान मंत्री जी यह जेहमत उठाएंगे कि आप के एक ही मंत्रालय में दो मंत्री दो किस्म की बात, खासकर जहां इंटरनेशनल रिलेशंस की बात हो, दो दिशाओं में आप बात न कर के एक ही दिशा में बात हो सके ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: Sir, there is no difference whatsoever. The Prime Minister has made it clear today that we, being an upholder of democracy, want to see to it that a democratic Government is set up there, and no signal is given by India that a democratic Government is thrown out by a military rule or by some criminals, as in some cases it happened. We are the supporters of democracy. We are the largest democracy, and that is why we do not want to give a signal. That comes up in our consideration. The hon. Member wanted to see a difference in our statements. I would like to make it clear that there is no such thing. His party and he himself are trying to create differences, but that is not possible ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MD. SALIM: International relation is a complicated thing... (*Interruption*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu,

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, the entire nation is very clear on the point that a proper climate should be created by Pakistan for resumption of dialogue. Is the Government aware of the fact that Pakistan Cabinet met yesterday and passed a Resolution reiterating Pakistan's strong commitment to the cause of Kashmir's liberation? I am quoting from today's newspaper report; if it is wrong, I can be corrected. Sir, the PTI from Islamabad has said, "Chaired by Chief Executive General Pervez Musharaf, the Cabinet reiterated Pakistan's strong commitment to the cause of Kashmir's Liberation."

Will the Government keep in mind the present attitude of Pakistan while responding to suggestion made by any side with regard to resumption of dialogue with Pakistan? Is the Government of India aware of the fact that the strong sentiment of the people of India is against resumption of dialogue with Pakistan till it stops the cross-border terrorism?

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: Sir, the news given in the newspaper has come to our notice. We are examining it. We have not yet got the details thereof;

So far as Kashmir is concerned, the entire Jammu and Kashmir is part and parcel of India. Therefore, whatever be the talks, the talks should be, taking into consideration that Jammu and Kashmir is part and parcel of mother India.

SHRI KARTAR SINGH DUGGAL: Is the Government aware of the fact that the main culprits today—I underline the words "culprits today"—in the struggle in Kashmir are tribals and that they are playing their historical role. I underline the words, "historical role". What steps are being taken to tame them?

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: I could not follow the question. Kindly repeat the question.

SHRI KARTAR SINGH DUGGAL: To my mind, today, tribal are fomenting the main trouble in the Kashmir struggle. What steps are being taken to tame them?

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: There is no such information... *(Interruptions)...*

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Tribals from Afghanistan.

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: सभापति जी, मैं सवाल कर सकता हूं?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Next Question. Question No. 264.

*264. *[The Questioner (Shri Dipankar Mukherjee) was absent. For answer vide page 26 infra]*

Benefit to Data Processing Assistants

*265. **DR. A. K. PATEL:** Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether any proposal is under consideration of Government to extend the benefit of various court judgements for similarly placed employees with regard to pay scales of erstwhile Data Processing Assistants in the grade of DPA (Grade-III) (scale 1600-2600) as per Fourth Pay Commission's recommendations in the Department of N.S.S.O. under the Ministry of Statistics;